

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

February 4, 2010

No. 09-30825
Summary Calendar

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

KELVIN WELLS,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

DOUG WELBORN, Clerk of Court, 19th JDC,

Defendant - Appellee

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Louisiana
USDC No. 3:09-CV-468

Before KING, STEWART, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff–appellant Kelvin Wells, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, appeals the district court’s dismissal of his Fourteenth Amendment due process and equal protection claims. Wells alleged that the appellee, a Louisiana clerk of court, improperly processed his various petitions for relief. The district court dismissed Wells’s claims with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), determining that Wells failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 09-30825

In his briefing to this court, Wells fails to identify any error in the district court's dismissal of his claims. Instead Wells merely reiterates factual allegations and generalized statements of the law. "Although we liberally construe briefs of *pro se* litigants and apply less stringent standards to parties proceeding *pro se* . . . , *pro se* parties must still brief the issues and reasonably comply with the standards of Rule 28." *Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir.1995). *See also* FED. R. APP. P. 28 (requiring an appellant's brief to contain, among other things, a statement of the issues and an argument); *United States v. Wilkes*, 20 F.3d 651, 653 (5th Cir. 1994) ("[P]*ro se* litigants, like all other parties, must abide by the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.").

Because Wells fails to properly argue or present issues in his appellate brief, we consider those issues to be abandoned. *United States v. Beaumont*, 972 F.2d 553, 563 (5th Cir. 1992); *Price v. Digital Equip. Corp.*, 846 F.2d 1026, 1028 (5th Cir. 1988) ("[A]rguments must be briefed to be preserved."). Because Wells has abandoned all issues on appeal, Wells's appeal is without arguable merit and is thus frivolous. *See Newsome v. EEOC*, 301 F.3d 227, 233 (5th Cir. 2002). Because the appeal is frivolous, it is DISMISSED. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2. DISMISSED.